IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

CHRISTIE ANDREWS,)	
Plaintiff,)	NO. 3:21-cv-00526
v.)	110. 3.21 01 00320
TRI STAR SPORTS AND ENTERTAINMENT GROUP, INC.,)	JUDGE RICHARDSON
Defendant.)	

ORDER

Pending before the Court is Defendant's renewed unopposed motion to seal exhibits or portions thereof to Plaintiff's response in opposition to Defendant's motion for summary judgment. (Doc. No. 70, "renewed motion"). On April 26, 2023, the Court entered an order denying without prejudice Defendant's initial motion for leave to file under seal exhibits or portions thereof to Plaintiff's response in opposition to Defendant's motion for summary judgment. (Doc. No. 67). The Court explained the Defendant had not filed unredacted versions of the documents it sought to have filed under seal, and the Court requested that Defendant file these documents with a renewed motion. (*Id.*). Defendant has now filed a renewed motion and has provided the unredacted documents. (Doc. Nos. 70, 71). The renewed motion at Doc. No. 70, however, has not been amended by Defendant to correspond to the unredacted documents at Doc. Nos. 71-1–10. Instead, the renewed motion refers to the *redacted* versions of the documents. There are two issues with this: 1) Defendant seeks leave to file under seal the *unredacted* versions of the documents, not the redacted versions that are currently available to the public, and 2) the page numbers enumerated in the renewed motion do not correspond to the sealed documents at Doc.

Nos. 71-1–10. For example, the renewed motion requests leave to file Doc. 48-1 at 559–561 under seal. (Doc. No. 70 at 1). Doc. No. 48-1, however, is the *redacted* version of the document, and thus is actually a document that evidently need not be filed under seal. Even if the Court could surmise which of the unredacted documents that Doc. No. 48-1 corresponds to, the pagination is completely different. None of the redacted versions of the documents filed under seal exceed

sixteen pages, and therefore there are no documents with the page range of pages 559–561.

Although the Court appreciates Defendant's efforts to comply with the Court's order at Doc. No. 67, the Court cannot resolve the renewed motion on the merits when it requests to seal documents that are identified with the incorrect document numbers and page numbers. For this reason, the renewed motion at Doc. No. 70 is DENIED without prejudice. Defendant SHALL file a second renewed motion which properly accounts for different document numbers and pagination.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Eli Richardson
ELI RICHARDSON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE